

Tilburg University

Represented speech

Goebel, Zane

Publication date:
2013

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication in Tilburg University Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Goebel, Z. (2013). *Represented speech: Private lives in public talk in the Indonesian bureaucracy*. (Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies; No. 78).

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies

Paper 78

Represented speech: Private lives in public talk in the Indonesian bureaucracy

by

Zane Goebel[®] (*La Trobe University, Melbourne & Tilburg University, Tilburg*)

z.goebel@latrobe.edu.au

© October 2013

Represented speech: Private lives in public talk in the Indonesian bureaucracy¹

Zane Goebel, La Trobe University, Melbourne & Tilburg University, Tilburg

Abstract

This paper draws together discussions around public and private, represented talk, and conviviality by showing how an interviewee uses linguistic features to frame instances of talk as either “represented private talk” or “represented public talk”. My empirical focus is an interview that was recorded as part of fieldwork on leadership practices in the Indonesian bureaucracy. In this interview with a department head it seems that he adds authenticity to accounts of his leadership practices by performing them through represented talk. His use of Javanese in instances of represented talk also helps index intimate social relations between himself and his staff, while in some instances the combination of reference to place and participants also helps to nest ideas of private within represented public talk.

Introduction

This paper engages with discussions around public and private, represented talk, and conviviality. While all three areas have received considerable scholarly attention in the past, here I seek to bring these areas together by showing how the use of particular linguistic features help to frame instances of represented talk as either “represented private talk” or “represented public talk”. In doing so, I also show how these instances of represented talk add authenticity to such accounts along with information about the intimate social relations that exist between the animator of this talk and those represented via this talk. This is not a straightforward delineation of domains, however, because some of this represented talk contains Javanese fragments which seem to nest the idea of private within talk represented as public.

My empirical focus will be data gathered as part of a linguistic anthropological study of leadership practices in the Indonesian bureaucracy that was conducted between August 2003 and February 2004 in Semarang, Central Java. In particular, I will focus upon one recorded interview held with a department head. I point out that the authenticity of this bureaucrat's account of his leadership philosophy in part relies upon his use of represented talk. He indexes this talk as either public or private through a combination of reference to place and multiple participants, while change in activity type – i.e. from explaining leadership practice to performing it – is indexed by alternation between Indonesian and Javanese or through the use of pitch and tempo. Just as importantly, I also point out that the use of Javanese is key to indexing an intimate friendly relationships with his staff.

After discussing some of the scholarship on public and private, represented talk, and conviviality, I go on to briefly describe the Indonesian context in which this research was conducted. Following this I provide an account of my fieldwork before turning to my analysis of interview data. In concluding I suggest some areas for future investigation, including discussions about whether and to what extent represented talk relates to instances of actual talk.

Public and private in represented speech

Scholarship on the public and private spheres and relations between them have pointed to the importance of examining the way these categories are mobilized in interaction once they have become widely recognized ideological categories (Gal, 2002; Gal & Woolard, 2001).

Typically, these categories consists of indexical relationships between linguistic form, person, social domain, social relations between persons involved in such social domains, activity type, epistemology, affect, and so on: in short, these categories are part of a “semiotic register” (Agha, 2007a), or if you like a “speech genre” (Bakhtin, 1986). Scholarship on

public and private has shown how register specific features can invoke public and private contexts (Gal, 2002; Gal & Woolard, 2001; Hill, 2001). This observation sits with suite of ideas, including “contextualization cues” (Gumperz, 1982) and more recent framing of these ideas whereby particular contextualization cues are seen as “signs” or “emblems” which when used in sufficient amounts – i.e. just enough – invoke particular contexts (Agha, 2007a; Blommaert & Varis, 2011; Duranti & Goodwin, 1992).

Represented speech is one exemplar of how people can move themselves and co-participants from public to private contexts or from one private context to another. Represented speech, a term coined by Tannen (1989) and further developed by Agha (2007a) and Clift and Holt (2007), refers to instances of reported talk where reports include not only accounts of what was said but also how the “animator” (Goffman, 1981) of the reported talk felt about the event, the person(s) being reported, and their relationship to them. Represented talk is often found in conversational narratives, gossip, and other forms of related small talk, which have numerous functions, such as socializing newcomers into normative ways of interacting, understanding why events occurred, self-promotion, establishing and maintaining convivial relations, identifying insiders and outsiders, representing social relations between reporter/teller and those being reported about, and so on (e.g. Bauman, 2004; Besnier, 2009; Coupland, 2003; Georgakopoulou, 2007; Goebel, 2010; Ochs & Capps, 2001).

While much of the work on narrative and represented talk highlights such relationships as conflictual (e.g. the teller/hero versus an antagonist who has behaved inappropriately), work on conviviality in the Humanities and Social Sciences in general (e.g. Ang, 2003; Baumann, 1996; Bunnell, Yea, Peake, Skelton, & Smith, 2012; Karner & Parker, 2010; Landau & Freemantle, 2009; Werbner, 1997; Wise & Velayutham, 2009) and sociolinguistics in particular (e.g. Blommaert, 2012; Coupland, 2003; Enfield & Levinson, 2006; Ryoo, 2005; Tannen, 1984; Williams & Stroud, 2012) invites us to take a closer look at some understudied

convivial aspects of represented talk. Of special interest here is the function of representing convivial social relations, which seems to be part of the common practice of adding authority and authenticity (e.g. “I was there”) to an animator’s account of represented talk (Clift, 2006; Clift & Holt, 2007). While some point out that conviviality also involves contestation (Williams & Stroud, 2012), in this paper I want to focus primarily on the positive aspects of conviviality, which include the human tendency to be prosocial (Boyd & Richerson, 2006; Enfield, 2006, 2009; Levinson, 2006; Liszkowski, 2006; Tomasello, 2006).

Indonesia

Located between Australia and the Southern parts of Asia, Indonesia is an archipelago nation made up of more than 17,000 islands. Depending on who is counting and how language is defined (Agha, 2007b) there are between 400-1000 languages in Indonesia (e.g. Abas 1987; Dardjowidjojo 1998; Sneddon 2003). In general, many of Indonesia’s 240 million people have competence to use or at least comprehend two or more semiotic systems commonly referred to as “Language”. Of importance for this paper are Indonesian, the national language and a local variety of Javanese. Indonesian in its many varieties has become the stereotypical language of an Indonesian public. While the process of creating an Indonesian public had its antecedents in the Dutch colonial period (Errington, 1998a, 2000; Goebel, 2010), the period from 1966 was especially important in the development of this ideology. This is so because the increase in important standardizing one-to-many participation frameworks, such as schooling, radio, television, and language policy. Through its circulation in these frameworks Indonesian has become indexed to these frameworks with the result being Indonesian has become the language of an Indonesian public (Errington, 1995), while also becoming the ideological standard for public address in one-to-many participant frameworks (e.g. school classrooms, television broadcasts, newspapers, census

Indonesian sits in contrast to local vernacular varieties of Indonesian, often referred to as Malay, and regional languages, which have stereotypical relationships with the private and intimate spheres. Regional languages have both standardized and localized variants and these variants also have stereotypical relationships with the public and private sphere. Errington (1995), for example, has pointed out that in rural Java in the 1980s *kromo* or *básá* variants of Javanese became associated with a co-ethnic public. In addition, with its vocabulary of around one thousand words, *básá* has also been described as the language used among strangers (e.g. Bax, 1974; Errington, 1985; Smith-Hefner, 1983; Wolff & Poedjosoedarmo, 1982), the language of formal speeches and ceremony, that language of conversation amongst or to nobility (e.g. Errington, 1985, 1988; Wolff & Poedjosoedarmo, 1982), and the language which presupposes a different type of social relationship than inferred by the use of another variant, *ngoko* (e.g. Errington, 1998b). In this paper I will primarily focus on the alternation between Indonesian and the *ngoko* variant of Javanese, which among other things has been described as the language of the self, thought, and as the language used among family and friends (e.g. Bax, 1974; Errington, 1985, 1998b; Smith-Hefner, 1983; Wolff & Poedjosoedarmo, 1982).

The data

My data was gathered during fieldwork carried out from September 2003 until February 2004 in a government department within Central Java's provincial government office located in Semarang, the capital city of Central Java. While I initially went there to continue my work on inter-ethnic relations (Goebel, 2000), by early November my focus had changed to leadership practices in the Indonesian bureaucracy. I initially visited this department each day for around half a day (alternating between mornings and afternoons) to identify who might be willing to participate and where and when I might make recordings. During this initial period

I also talked with staff about when my presence would least likely interrupt their everyday duties, which turned out to be the last hour of working day. Accordingly, I visited this office a few times per week during the last hour of work.

While I was well aware that establishing relationships in this office over a short period might prove more difficult than in the neighborhoods I had previously worked, the task of establishing rapport and trust was also further complicated by the rapid political transition that had been underway in Indonesia since 1998, when the New Order regime ended. This transition included fiscal and political decentralization, the running of free and fair elections (with a presidential election slated for August 2004), the lifting of media censorship, and so on (Aspinall and Fealy 2003). During this time, ideas about what represented corrupt practices and thus who could be categorized as corrupt was being negotiated in the media as part of the ongoing election campaign. When it came to corruption, bureaucrats and politicians alike were frequently in the media gaze. To get some sense of just how often these ideas were repeated in the public sphere we can look at the front page stories of the Semarang based newspaper, *Suara Merdeka*, which according to one source has over 100,000 subscribers (Ririn Risnawati and Sri Syamsiyah Lestari Sjafiie 2012: 285). From August 2003 front page stories about corruption increased from around 3% of all stories to a peak of 22.6% in December, before falling to 6% by February 2004.

All of these circumstances and the fact that, Ismail, the head of department was promoted and moved to another location in January 2004 meant that I was unable to make recordings of talk in settings other than two staff meetings and a farewell party. Even so, these three sessions allowed me to make five-and-a-half hours of audio-video recordings and I was also able to record ten hours of interviews, and participate in and observe many face-to-face conversations in the office setting over my five month stay. After making these recordings I needed to transcribe and indicate on the transcript which language was which.

This was done using information from a ‘native speaking’ research assistant, Javanese and Indonesian dictionaries (e.g. Echols and Shadily 1992; Prawiroatmojo 1989; Prawiroatmojo 1993; Sudaryanto 1991), my own knowledge of Javanese and Indonesian, and post-recording interviews with participants using transcripts of talk from the two recorded meetings as stimulus for discussions about language usage.

Indexing conviviality between referents in an interview

What initially caught my attention when looking at my interview data was the department head’s (Ismail) propensity to represent other’s speech, while other public servants did this rarely if ever in my interviews with them. To give a rough quantitative picture, during the forty minute interview which the data presented below is drawn from (recorded on November 5, 2003), Ismail represented his interaction with his staff and with his superiors nearly fifty times. More specifically, out of the forty-eight occurrences of represented talk, thirty-three of these contained one or more fragments of ngoko Javanese, twelve were in Indonesian, two contained kromo fragments, and one had some English fragments. Here I will focus primarily on the use of ngoko Javanese to represent talk with his staff. What will become clear from this analysis is that Ismail’s represented speech often repeats an earlier point by way of providing an example of that point, which typically relate to his leadership philosophy. In doing so, I argue that he is adding authority and authenticity to his accounts, especially one of his overall claims that he has a friendly relationship with his staff. The use of ngoko Javanese interactionally achieves this by way of its indexical relationship with intimate contexts.

While I came to this particular interview with a few questions I wanted to ask about language practices, Ismail skillfully turned me back to what he wanted to focus upon: his leadership practices. The initial part of the interview can be seen as abstract of what he wanted to cover during the interview. He started by noting that he often created an

environment where his staff, who he referred to as friends, could enjoy their work. He went on to note that he also paid careful attention to ensuring regular bonuses for staff – keeping none for himself – helping his staff out if they had problems, helping towards the medical expenses of his staff’s children, and helping out by lending his car and a chauffeur when there was a death in one of his staff’s family. He then turned to pointing out that it was easy to be a boss, but harder to be a leader. He noted that he aspired to be a leader and that his success at this would be exemplified in his staff’s tears when he moved elsewhere and where his new staff would eagerly be awaiting him. After asking him how future leaders were prepared in the bureaucracy, he provided his personal experience where he noted that he had three sub-section heads who he was preparing to take his place. Excerpt 1 takes up on this theme while providing the first example of the many examples of represented talk in this interview. In this case, Ismail’s use of a ngoko Javanese deictic of place helps take the interview into a past ‘private’ interaction between himself and members of his staff.

Excerpt 1 I mentor my staff to be future leaders

Ismail

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | dan saya menyiapkan kaderisasi sudah | And I prepare [them] for the third level |
| 2 | lapis ketiga (3.0) kapanpun saya pindah | [of management]. Whenever I leave from |
| 3 | dari sini . saya sudah punya calon | here I will already have a replacement |
| 4 | pengganti dari satu di antara tiga kasubag | candidate, from, one from amongst the |
| 5 | (5.0) jadi tiga kasubag di asistan staf . itu | three sub-section heads. So that the three |
| 6 | sudah ada penggantinya semua . itu sudah | sub-section heads [also] have |
| 7 | saya siapin . | replacements from their staff. I have
already prepared for this. |

Me

8 he em he em.

Yes, yes.

Ismail

9	dan itu prosesnya a penyiapan itu tidak	And that process, um, of preparation is
10	secara khusus . tapi sambil sambil jalan	not done formally, but while, while [we]
11	proses dengan lemparan lemparan	go through the provision of tasks “please
12	pekerjaan . iki tolong dirampungi . iki	get this done, please finish this ”
13	tolong selesaikan =	

In Ex. 1 we can see that lines 1-7 provide narrative-like orienting information in Indonesian. This information includes “who”, via the use of *saya* in this case Ismail (line 1), *kasubag* “sub-section heads” (line 4), and *staf* “staff” (line 5), and “where” via the use of *sini* “here” (line 3). The “when” is initially indexed by *sudah* “already” (line 1). After providing orienting information this is followed by an example of the types of socialization processes undertaken by Ismail, *itu tidak secara khusus, tapi sambil sambil jalan proses dengan lemparan lemparan pekerjaan* “That is not done formally, but while [we] go through the provision of tasks” (lines 9-12). We are then given a specific example of these actions via represented talk with his staff on lines 12-13.

In this represented talk there are two instances of the ngoko Javanese deictic *iki* “this” (line 12) in an otherwise Indonesian utterance. In this instance a number of indexical possibilities are invoked through the use of this deictic. First, this alternation indexes a change in “activity type” (Levinson, 1992) or “footing” (Goffman, 1981) from one of “talking about the world” to providing an example of “talk in a lifeworld”. Second, by way of its indexical relationship with private talk in the home or neighborhood among intimates, the

use of *iki* brings the interviewee and Ismail into this private lifeworld. The represented talk here also seems to be “represented private talk.” This is so because the orienting information provided on lines 3-12 does not mention any setting in particular, especially when compared with the following excerpts which refer to “staff meetings”.

The use of *iki* also presupposes an intimate relationship between Ismail and his staff because *ngoko* is indexically related to intimate and private settings. Even so, here this is quite ambiguous because there is also an equally strong indexical link between exchanges of *ngoko* Javanese and asymmetrical relationships. In this case, Ismail’s represented talk could also index such an asymmetrical boss-staff relationship. It is only as we move through the interview and other instances of represented talk that we get further support for this interpretation of intimacy.

It is also interesting to contrast this instance of represented talk with the next (Ex. 2), which has no alternation between Indonesian and Javanese. In contrast to Ex. 1, referents are explicitly referred to in the represented talk and in the orienting talk. Even so, as with the alternation between *ngoko* Javanese forms and Indonesian forms, it is the contrast between how one utterance is delivered in relation to the previous ones that help index utterances as represented speech. In this case, Ismail relies much more heavily on tempo and pitch to differentiate talk from represented talk. Just as importantly, the represented talk refers to a more public setting where talk is between Ismail and multiple staff in a meeting. The talk in Ex. 2 occurs immediately after that represented in Ex. 1.

Excerpt 2 There is no-one in this building who holds fortnightly meetings

Me

14

= he em he em .

Yes, yes.

Ismail

- 15 pada saat dia melaksanakan itu sering During the time he/she does these [tasks]
16 saya mengadakan rapat staf. itu juga I often hold a staff meeting, [something]
17 jarang dilakukan birokrat . saya rapat staf which is rarely done by bureaucrats, I
18 itu hampir dua minggu sekali . hold a staff meeting almost every two
weeks.

Me

- 19 he e:m . Yes.

Ismail

- 20 meting staf . khusus bagian saya = A staff meeting, specifically for my
section.

Seven turns deleted where I ask if it is a possibility for me to record staff meetings

Ismail

- 21 itu sering . saya dua minggu sekali saya [meetings are held often], I do it every
22 lakukan itu . two weeks.

Me

- 23 o:: . Yes.

Ismail

- 24 bisa sipat rapat staf itu saya memberikan The meeting can have the characteristic of
25 pengarahan . giving direction.

Me

- 26 he em = Yes.

Ismail

27 = directing (1.1) >saya punya tugas Giving direction. “I have these tasks,
28 ini ini . tolong kita selesaikan> . anda please let’s finish them, you this, this and
29 selesaikan ini . >anda ini ini ini> . atau this” or sometimes two directional
30 kadang . dua arah .

Me

31 he em . Yes.

Ismail

32 #saya# inginnya begini . @anda maunya “I want this. What do you want?” or
33 apa@ . #atau# >kadang kadang> satu arah sometimes one directional, from them.
34 . dari mereka .

Me

35 he em .

Ismail

36 saya hanya @buka tutup@ . ok keluhan I just open and close [the meeting]. “OK
37 anda **opo** [@**opo** **what** problems do you have, **what**
[problems]?”

Me

38 [he em . Yes.

Ismail

39 saya tampung@ . I take it in.

Me

In continuing his account of his leadership practices, in Ex. 2 Ismail builds upon his explanation of his socialization activities by tying it to the holding of fortnightly meetings (lines 16-18, 20, and 21-22). Note that the orienting information about “who” is now his staff in general (e.g. lines 16-17, and 20), rather than three specific sub-sections heads (as in Ex. 1) and *saya* “I” in this case Ismail (lines 16, 17, and 21). The “where” was in the meeting room in the building, which was discussed in the seven deleted turns when I asked him about the possibility of recording meetings, The “when” is indexed through a combination of the use of *pada saat* “at the time” and reference to his earlier talk where Ismail described his actions of giving tasks to staff (lines 12-13 in Ex. 1).

The delivery of the orienting information from lines 14-27 does not have the variations in tempo and pitch that start on line 27. It is these changes in tempo and pitch that help index change in activity type from talking about practices in general to a specific example of this practice via represented public talk (lines 27-29, 32-33, and 36-37). Here there are both similarities and differences between public and private, compared with how these ideas were invoked in Ex. 1. On the one hand, while here I was transported into the private world of Ismail and his staff – it was private because I was not there – his represented talk was “represented public talk” because it was in a specific ‘public’ setting, namely a staff meeting, and was a language stereotypically associated with addressing a public.

On lines 27-29 Ismail achieves this by speeding up his tempo (indicated by “>” surrounding the utterance that is spoken faster) then slowing down before speeding up again. This way of indexing represented speech contrasts with his next three instances of represented speech (lines 32-33 and 36-37) where he alternates between an increased volume (indicated by “#” surrounding the work or utterance), normal volume, and decreased volume

(indicated by “@” surrounding the work or utterance). As with Ex. 1, representations of talk add authenticity (in this case saying something like “believe me I really do hold fortnightly meetings”).

The represented talk in Ex. 2 also contrasts with that in Ex. 1 because referents are included in the represented talk in addition to being noted in the orienting talk. For example, Ismail refers to himself (*saya*) on lines 27 and 32 an anonymous individual member of his staff *anda* “you” (lines 28, 29, 32, and 37), and importantly he uses *kita* “us/we” (line 28) and *mereka* “they/them” (line 34). These last two referents also help reinforce the idea of public invoked through the regular reference to “staff meetings” via way of pointing to multiple participants who would be involved in such meetings. What is also interesting here is the alternation to Javanese fragments in this case *opo* “what” on line 37. As with Ex. 1, this usage seems to add to his claims of having intimate friendly social relationships with his staff. The indexical relationship between ngoko forms and intimate private contexts also helps to nest the idea of private within talk that has previously framed the situation recounted as public.

Ismail’s represented public talk in Ex. 2 also contrasts with his next instance of represented public talk, where he now tries to convince me that he also publicly respects his staff. While he notes this in Indonesian, he also performs such valuing behavior through the use of kromo Javanese fragments, which are stereotypically reserved for asymmetrical exchanges where a subordinate would give kromo to a superior rather than the opposite (e.g. Errington, 1986, 1988, 1998b; Goebel, 2007, 2010; Wolff & Poedjosoedarmo, 1982), as is the case here. The talk in Ex. 3 follows nearly directly on from that represented in Ex. 2 and is preceded by Ismail again noting that he holds regular fortnightly meetings in contrast with the three sections on this floor and the nine bureaus in the building who do not. He goes on to note that he learned the value of meetings for evaluation and mentoring when he worked in the private sector where they had a meeting each Saturday.

Excerpt 3 I always publicly acknowledge my staff's achievements

Ismail

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| 1 | nah #dalam forum rapat itu sering saya | So, in the forum of a meeting, I often use |
| 2 | menggunakan# istilah . >ok saya | the phrase “ok I THANK YOU , I thank |
| 3 | MATUR NUHUN . saya terima kasih | you [because] our previous tasks which |
| 4 | kemarin tugas tugas yang kita terima . | we received which we were entrusted |
| 5 | yang dipercayakan pada kita sudah selesai | with are finished. Ok Brother Agus, |
| 6 | . ok mas agus anda kemaren jadi | yesterday you were a good leader, good |
| 7 | komandan> . good (???) job . saya kasih | (???) job”. I congratulate [him] in front of |
| 8 | penghargaan di depan teman temannya . | his friends. |

The orienting information that precedes the represented talk on lines 2-7 includes “who” which is indexed on line 1 by *saya* “I/me” (in this case Ismail), and the use of *rapat* “meeting” presupposes the multiple people who attend meetings. The where is also indicated by the use of *rapat*, while the when is indicated by a deictic *itu* “that”, which often indicates spatial distance between participants and referent, but here indexes spatial and temporal distance from participants (Ismail and myself) and “that meeting”. In contrast to Ex. 2, Ismail also met pragmatically frames his utterance as reported talk through his use of *sering saya menggunakan istilah* “I often use the phrase” on lines 1-2. As with Ex. 2, however, here Ismail continues to use referents in his represented talk. These include *saya* (I/me in this case Ismail on lines 2 and 3), *kita* “us/we” (lines 4 and 5), *Mas Agues* “Brother Agues” (line 6) and *anda* “you” (line 6). It is the combination of *rapat* “meeting” (line 1) and the multiple instances of *kita* “we/us” (lines 4-5) that help frame this talk as among multiple participants and thus “represented public talk”.

In addition to pointing out that he congratulates those who do a good job in front of his friends in a meeting (and thus in public), he performs this congratulation on line 3 of his represented talk through his account of how he thanks them, in this case using an other elevating kromo Javanese form *matur nuhun* “thanks”. While the use of this form seems atypical in relation to ideologies about Javanese usage, here its atypical nature helps to add authenticity to his account of how he congratulates and says thanks to his staff. This is so because this utterance is stereotypically used upwards (i.e. from subordinates to superior), rather than the reverse as is the case here. In doing so, this usage tropes on the “other elevating” indexical properties of kromo offering a meaning of something like “thank you very much respected staff”.

In the talk that follows, not reproduced in full here, Ismail notes that he always publicly thanks and congratulates his staff in this way because it engenders loyalty to him, which he also encourages through access to bonuses and many other practices. As he continues, he notes that his generous practices has kept him poor and in a ramshackle one-story house when compared to other bureaucrats of the same level. He justifies this practice by first citing his belief in a Javanese philosophy that people should be interested in making a good name for themselves first, rather than trying to enrich themselves. He clarifies this further by saying that once a person has a good name, then the money will follow. In representing himself as someone who has enacted this philosophy, he sees the benefits of such an approach as making him the first person to be approached when there is a problem to be solved.

Following this he points out that he often jokes – represented in ngoko Javanese – with his staff through the use of statements that link organizational imperatives with their own financial needs. He suggests that this approach is much more effective than ordering them about, even though as a boss he is within his rights to do so. He then returns back to the need to continually thank and positively evaluate staff contributions as a way of encouraging them

to also use initiative (again using more ngoko Javanese to represent talk). After asking him where he studied these leadership philosophies, Ismail pointed out that he always enjoyed reading about successful people and was also a student activist leader in the late 1980s. This along with his experience working for a foreign company in Jakarta helped him learn the value of professionalism. He summed up by noting that because of these experiences he never stopped studying and learning from his past practices. All of this talk occurred over the course of five minutes before the following piece of talk (Ex. 4), which contrasts with my earlier examples because it now also represents Ismail's staff's response to his own talk, rather than just Ismail's talk to his staff.

Excerpt 4 Representing dialogue with staff

Ismail

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1 tahun kemarin saya ditugasi untuk | Last year I was given the task of |
| 2 menyiapkan buku laporan . pertanggung | preparing [the governor's] accountability |
| 3 jawaban . >itu setiap tahun> . tapi | report, that [is done], every year. But |
| 4 manajemen tahun ini dan tahun depan | management from this year to the next is |
| 5 pasti beda . | certain to be different. |

Me

- | | |
|---------------|------|
| 6 he e:m . | Yes. |
|---------------|------|

Ismail

- | | |
|---|--|
| 7 #berangkat# . dari me- a: pengalaman | Starting from (false start) um, this |
| 8 yang ini . kemudian diinovasi (1.4) a: | experience, then we innovate. Um study |
| 9 mempelajari kemarin lemahnya di mana . | where [our] past weaknesses were, it's |

10 @gitu@ . nah kita grip untuk tahun depan like that. So we get an understanding [of
 11 . #wah **iki** loh ya . kemarin **iki bobol** loh# the problems] for the following year “Heh
 12 . **this** right, last time **this failed** right?”

Me

13 he em = Yes.

Ismail

14 = piyé ben ora bobol . @o ngené “What [do we do] so that [this] doesn’t
 15 bos (???) . fail?”. “Oh, it’s like this Boss.”

Me

16 he: [:m Yes.

Ismail

17 [digrip@ . tapi inisiatip dari @temen [the problem] is understood. But the
 18 temen@ . initiative comes from my friends.

Me

19 he em . Yes.

Ismail

20 saya hanya . di rapat staf hanya I just, in the staff meeting I just give an
 21 menggariskan . **iki** loh ya . tugas kita . outline, “its like **this** yeah, our task, this
 22 targetnya ini . inputnya nanti diharapkan target, the input and output we hope for is
 23 ini outputnya kaya begini . like this”.

As with most of his represented talk, Ismail starts with a generalized topic, in this case “learning from experience” before representing public talk on lines 11, 14-15, and 21-23.

Again there is orienting information that helps us understand these instances of represented talk. In Ex. 4 there is the “who” *saya* “I/me”, in this case Ismail (line 1), those who are involved in the process of management (line 4), and more specific information on plural referents through the use of *kita* “we/us” (line 10). The “where” is harder to pin down without reference to the talk that follows the first instance of represented talk, especially line 20 where *di rapat* “in a meeting” is used. The “when” is also ambiguous because of Ismail’s temporal comparisons between *kemarin* “the past” (line 9) and *tahun depan* “next year” (line 10) and it is only when he moves into represented speech that we know that this is an example of “learning from the past” that has already occurred.

Here the change in activity type from talking about experiences to giving performed examples of them is achieved on line 11 through a combination of increased pitch, the use of *wah* (an exclamation token often found at the start of an utterance), and the use of the ngoko Javanese deictic *iki* “this”. In addition to helping index a change in activity type, the use of ngoko Javanese has a number of other indexical potentials, including adding authority to his account (e.g. “I was there and said this”), and to index asymmetrical social relations and/or intimate social relations.

As with my interpretation of other ngoko usage, here I suggest it is the intimate meaning being indexed. There are a number of pieces of evidence that support this interpretation. First, Ismail uses more than just ngoko Javanese deictic here, for example he also uses ngoko Javanese *bobol* “to fail” on line 11, and in his following instance of represented talk ngoko usage is even more pronounced with the whole utterance being in ngoko on line 14. Second, the asymmetrical interpretation doesn’t hold because Ismail represents an unnamed member of staff talking with him in ngoko Javanese (lines 14-15). Finally, Ismail frames this interaction as one amongst *teman teman* “friends” by noting that initiatives come from his friends (lines 17-18). By the time Ismail moves to the third

example of a rapid sequence of represented talk (lines 21-23), it also clear that this in represented public talk. This is achieved through a combination of his earlier orientation where he mentioned multiple participants (kita “us/we”) and the use of *di rapat staff* “in a staff meeting”. As with Ex. 2, the use of ngoko Javanese helps to nest the idea of intimate friendly relations between Ismail and his staff within this represented public talk.

Conclusion

Using interview data gathered as part of linguistic anthropological fieldwork on leadership practices in the Indonesian bureaucracy during 2003-2004, this paper draws together discussions around public and private, represented talk, and conviviality by showing how an interviewee uses linguistic features to frame instances of talk as either “represented private talk” or “represented public talk”. As found in previous work on represented talk (e.g. Clift, 2006; Clift & Holt, 2007; Tannen, 1989), in my data represented talk adds authenticity to my interviewee’s accounts of his leadership practices. This bureaucrat’s use of Javanese in instances of represented talk also helps index intimate social relations between himself and his staff, while in some instances the combination of reference to place and participants also helps to nest ideas of private within represented public talk.

While the three areas that I draw upon here have a long history of scholarly inquiry within Sociolinguistic and Linguistic Anthropology, when taken together this synthesis represents a “road less travelled” in each of these individual areas. In reflecting on my other data of actual conversations between the head of this government department and his staff in staff meetings one further area for future work emerges. In particular, while work on reported talk generally points out the large gap between reports of interaction and actual interaction – hence the use of “represented” – I found many uncanny resemblances between this bureaucrat’s representations of his talk with staff in meetings and his actual talk in

subsequent meetings. I thus wonder how the links between these two types of communicative events might be fruitfully explored.

Notes

1. As with most academic work, I need to start with a round of thanks to all those who made it possible for me to write this paper. I would like to start by thanking Lauren Zentz and Chris Taylor for doing a stellar job of organizing this exciting panel entitled “Mediating Private and (Counter) Public Discourse: Genre, Addressivity, and the Semiotics of (not) Belonging” for the 2013 AAA in Chicago. I was able to analyze much of the data presented here because of a generous grant from the Australian Research Council (DP130102121). Research of this kind can, of course, not be done without the patience, good humor, and friendship offered by those who became participants. For this paper I am especially indebted to Ismail, who has become a model of inspirational leadership. I would also like to thank a number of research assistants who have helped me transcribe my recordings and locate some of the literature discussed here. I am especially indebted to Eni Goebel, Mas Ketut, Mas Supri, Catherine Coyne, and Jasmine Dreher. I have many colleagues within the Faculty of Humanities and Social Science who have facilitated my sabbatical, which has given me the chance to get back to this data. In particular I would like to thank Nick Herriman, Dirk Tomsa, Linda Seymour, Lidia Tanaka, Yangbin Chen, Kaori Okano, and Chris Mackie. Finally, I would also like to thank Ad Backus, Herman Beck, Jan Blommaert, Sjaak Kroon, Max Spotti, Jef Van der Aa, Piia Varis, and the graduate students at Babylon for providing a welcoming, warm, and stimulating environment to reflect and to write up this article during my sabbatical.

References

- Agha, A. (2007a). *Language and social relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Agha, A. (2007b). The Object Called "Language" and the Subject of Linguistics. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 35(3), 217-235. doi: 10.1177/0075424207304240
- Ang, I. (2003). Together-in-difference: beyond diaspora into hybridity. *Asian Studies Review*, 27, 141-154.
- Bakhtin, M. (1986). The Problem of Speech Genres (V. W. McGee, Trans.). In M. M. Bakhtin (Ed.), *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays* (pp. 60-102). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Bauman, R. (2004). *A world of others' words: cross-cultural perspectives on intertextuality*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Baumann, G. (1996). *Contesting culture: Discourses of identity in multi-ethnic London*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bax, G. W. (1974). *Language and social structure in a Javanese village*. (PhD), Tulane University, Tulane, USA.
- Besnier, N. (2009). *Gossip and the everyday production of politics*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Blommaert, J. (2012). Complexity, accent and conviviality: concluding comments. *Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies*, 26, 1-14.
- Blommaert, J., & Varis, P. (2011). Enough is enough: the heuristics of authenticity in superdiversity. *Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies* 76 (London, Albany, Gent, Tilburg) [Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies 2, Tilburg University].
- Boyd, R., & Richerson, P. (2006). Culture and the evolution of the human social instincts. In N. Enfield & S. Levinson (Eds.), *Roots of Human Sociality: Culture, Cognition and Interaction* (pp. 453-477). Oxford: Berg.

- Bunnell, T., Yea, S., Peake, L., Skelton, T., & Smith, M. (2012). Geographies of friendships. *Progress in Human Geography*, 36(4), 490-507.
- Clift, R. (2006). Indexing stance: Reported speech as an interactional evidential. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 10(5), 569-595. doi: doi:10.1111/j.1467-9841.2006.00296.x
- Clift, R., & Holt, E. (2007). Introduction. In E. Holt & R. Clift (Eds.), *Reported talk: Reporting speech in interaction* (pp. 1-15). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coupland, J. (2003). Small Talk: Social Functions. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 36(1), 1-6.
- Duranti, A., & Goodwin, C. (1992). *Rethinking context: language as an interactive phenomenon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Enfield, N. (2006). Social consequences of common ground. In N. Enfield & S. Levinson (Eds.), *Roots of Human Sociality: Culture, Cognition and Interaction* (pp. 399-430). Oxford: Berg.
- Enfield, N. (2009). Relationship thinking and human pragmatics. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41(1), 60-78.
- Enfield, N., & Levinson, S. (2006). Introduction: Human sociality as a new interdisciplinary field. In N. J. Enfield & S. C. Levinson (Eds.), *Roots of Human Sociality: Culture, Cognition and Interaction* (pp. 1-35). Oxford: Berg.
- Errington, J. (1985). *Language and social change in Java: Linguistic reflexes of modernization in a traditional royal polity*. Ohio: Ohio University Press.
- Errington, J. (1986). Continuity and change in Indonesian language development. *Journal of Asian Studies*, 45(2), 329-353.
- Errington, J. (1988). *Structure and style in Javanese: A semiotic view of linguistic etiquette*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Errington, J. (1995). State speech for peripheral publics in Java. *Pragmatics*, 5(2), 213-224.

- Errington, J. (1998a). Indonesian('s) development: On the state of a language of state. In B. B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard & P. V. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory* (pp. 271-284). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Errington, J. (1998b). *Shifting languages: Interaction and identity in Javanese Indonesia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Errington, J. (2000). Indonesian('s) authority. In P. V. Kroskrity (Ed.), *Regimes of language: Ideologies, politics, and identities (Advanced Seminar Series)* (pp. 205-227). Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research.
- Gal, S. (2002). A semiotics of the public/private distinction. *Differences: a journal of feminist cultural studies*, 13(1), 77-95.
- Gal, S., & Woolard, K. (2001). Constructing languages and publics: Authority and representation. In S. Gal & K. Woolard (Eds.), *Languages and publics: The making of authority* (pp. 1-12). Manchester, UK: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Georgakopoulou, A. (2007). *Small stories, interaction and identities*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Goebel, Z. (2000). *Communicative competence in Indonesian: Language choice in inter-ethnic interactions in Semarang*. (PhD), Northern Territory University, Darwin.
- Goebel, Z. (2007). Enregisterment and appropriation in Javanese-Indonesian bilingual talk. *Language in Society*, 36(4), 511-531.
- Goebel, Z. (2010). *Language, migration and identity: neighborhood talk in Indonesia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Hill, J. (2001). Mock Spanish, covert racism, and the (leaky) boundary between public and private spheres. In S. Gal & K. Woolard (Eds.), *Languages and publics: The making of authority* (pp. 83-102). Manchester, UK: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Karner, C., & Parker, D. (2010). Conviviality and Conflict: Pluralism, Resilience and Hope in Inner-City Birmingham. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 37(3), 355-372.
- Landau, L. B., & Freemantle, I. (2009). Tactical Cosmopolitanism and Idioms of Belonging: Insertion and Self-Exclusion in Johannesburg. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36(3), 375-390.
- Levinson, S. (1992). Activity types and language. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings* (pp. 66-100). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levinson, S. (2006). On the human "interaction engine". In N. Enfield & S. Levinson (Eds.), *Roots of Human Sociality: Culture, Cognition and Interaction* (pp. 39-69). Oxford: Berg.
- Liszkowski, U. (2006). Infant pointing at 12 months: communicative goals, motives, and social-cognitive abilities. In N. Enfield & S. Levinson (Eds.), *Roots of Human Sociality: Culture, Cognition and Interaction* (pp. 153-178). Oxford: Berg.
- Ochs, E., & Capps, L. (2001). *Living narrative*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Ryoo, H.-K. (2005). Achieving friendly interactions: A study of service encounters between Korean shopkeepers and African-American customers. *Discourse and Society*, 16(1), 79-105.
- Smith-Hefner, N. (1983). *Language and social identity: Speaking Javanese in Tengger*. (PhD), University of Michigan, Michigan.
- Tannen, D. (1984). *Conversational style: Analyzing talk among friends*. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.

- Tannen, D. (1989). *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tomasello, M. (2006). Why don't apes point? In N. Enfield & S. Levinson (Eds.), *Roots of Human Sociality: Culture, Cognition and Interaction* (pp. 506-524). Oxford: Berg.
- Werbner, P. (1997). Introduction: The dialectics of cultural hybridity. In P. Werbner & T. Modood (Eds.), *Debating cultural hybridity. multi-cultural identities and the politics of anti-racism*. (pp. 1-28). London & New Jersey: Zed Books.
- Williams, Q., & Stroud, C. (2012). Multilingualism in transformative spaces: contact and conviviality. *Language Policy*, 1-23.
- Wise, A., & Velayutham, S. (Eds.). (2009). *Everyday multiculturalism*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Wolff, J., & Poedjosoedarmo, S. (1982). *Communicative codes in Central Java*. New York: Cornell University.